

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Inventors : David Milstein | Appeal No. |
| Appln. No.: 10/668,438 | |
| Filed : September 23, 2003 | Group Art Unit: 2411 |
| For : CONTENT AND TASK-EXECUTION SERVICES PROVIDED THROUGH DIALOG-BASED INTERFACES | Examiner: Greg Bengzon |
| Docket No.: M61.12-0545 | |

BRIEF FOR APPELLANT

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 | Electronically Filed on JUNE 6, 2008 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|

Sir:

This is an Appeal from a Final Office Action dated November 1, 2007, in which claims 1, 2 and 4-60 were rejected. Of these claims, claims 1, 2, and 6-25 remain pending. Appellant respectfully submits that the remaining pending claims are allowable and requests that the Board reverse the rejection and find that these claims are in condition for allowance.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Microsoft, a corporation organized under the laws of the state of Washington, and having offices at One Microsoft Way, Redmond, WA 98052, has acquired the entire right, title and interest in and to the invention, the application, and any and all patents to be obtained therefor, as set forth in the Assignment filed with the patent application and recorded on Reel 014545, frame 0436.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There is no known related appeal or interference that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-59 were originally presented. In an amendment filed August 16, 2007, claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 12, 26, 34-38, 42, 44, 45, 49, 53 and 55 were amended, claim 3 was cancelled and new claim 60 was added. An amendment after final was filed on December 20th, 2007 but, in accordance with an advisory action dated January 31, 2008, the proposed amendments were not entered. A second amendment after final was then filed on March 5th, 2008. In accordance with a second advisory action dated April 23, 2008, the amendments proposed in the second amendment after final were entered. Thus, in accordance with the second amendment after final, claims 4, 5 and 26-60 were cancelled, and claim 1 was amended. Thus, claims 1, 2 and 6-25 are presented in the present appeal.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-59 were originally presented. An amendment filed August 16, 2007, amended claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 12, 26, 34-38, 42, 44, 45, 49, 53 and 55, cancelled claim 3, and added a new claim 60. An amendment after final was filed on December 20th, 2007 but, in accordance with an advisory action dated January 31, 2008, the amendments proposed therein were not entered. A second amendment after final was then filed on March 5th, 2008. In accordance with a second advisory action dated April 23, 2008, the amendments proposed in the second amendment after final were entered. In accordance with the second amendment after final, claim 1 was amended and claims 4, 5 and 26-60 were cancelled. The remaining claims 1, 2 and 6-25 are presented in the present appeal.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

1. Introduction

Embodiments of the present invention generally pertain to computer-implemented methods for providing a user with task-execution services based on the user's dialog-based communication with a communication service, for example, an instant messaging service.

2. Brief Background

There are known systems that enable a user to interact with a server to retrieve information, or to remotely perform a task. The typical known system, however, requires a user to utilize specialized software that is maintained on the user's client machine. The software typically operates in association with its own user interface, which is not always user-friendly, and often requires familiarity with a relatively complex collection of specialized command words. As the client-side software is updated or expanded upon, all copies must be updated. If a user purchases a new device, a new copy of the client-side software must be obtained, installed, and in many cases re-configured. The client-side software generally takes up memory space on every device utilized to interact with the server. This use of space is of concern, especially for devices, such as cell phones and mobile computing devices, which can have a relatively limited storage capacity.

Further, in many instances, client-side software utilized to interact with a server varies dramatically from one device to another. For example, the user interface can be significantly inconsistent from one computing device to the next. Presently, it is relatively difficult for a user to efficiently interact with a server to access content, or to remotely perform a task, when the user does not have access to a personal computer. There is a need for a consistent client interface that provides a relatively standard way to interact with a server regardless of the size or mobility of a given computing device.

Still further, it is not uncommon for users to be required to load and interact with multiple user interfaces to accomplish multiple server interactions. For example, a first user

interface might be required to pay a bill, a second to retrieve sports-related content, and a third to edit a calendar-based schedule. There is a need for a single intuitive interface that can be utilized to effectuate transactions across multiple applications that would traditionally be accessed through separate and independent user interfaces.

3. The Present Invention

This appeal involves but a single independent claim, namely, claim 1. Claim 1 recites “a computer implemented method for task execution based on dialog-based communication with a communication service” (See Page 34, line 11 through Page 38, line 2). The claimed method includes a step of “receiving dialog from a user, the dialog being directed to a simulated entity” (block 1402 in FIG. 14, Page 35, lines 22-23). The method also includes “analyzing the dialog to identify a command” (Page 35, lines 24-29). The method also includes “performing a task on the user’s behalf based on the command” (block 1408 in FIG. 14, Page 36, lines 3-4). The method also includes “determining whether the user is authorized to utilize the application necessary to complete the task, and performing the task only if the user is authorized” (block 1302 in FIG. 13, Page 25, lines 10-12, also Page 36, lines 12-14). The method also includes “presenting the user with an opportunity to become authorized when the user is not authorized to utilize the application necessary to complete the task” (block 1304 in FIG. 13, Page 25, lines 12-14, also Page 36, lines 12-14). Finally, as claimed, presenting the user with an opportunity to become authorized comprises presenting the user with an opportunity to purchase access (block 1304 in FIG. 13, Page 25, lines 14-30, also Page 36, lines 12-14).

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The first ground of rejection to be reviewed is whether claims 1, 2 and 6-8, 13-19 and 21-25 are rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by the combination of Leber (US Pub. 2003/0182391) in view of Yairi (US Pub. 2004/0078424), and further in view of Kay (US Pub. 2003/0074410).

The second ground of rejection to be reviewed is whether claims 9-12 and 20 are rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by the combination of Leber (US Pub. 2003/0182391) in view of Yairi (US Pub. 2004/0078424), in view of Kay (US Pub. 2003/0074410), and still further in view of Kennewick (US Pub. 2004/0193420).

Appellant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2 and 6-25 are patentable over these complex proposed combinations of references and requests that the Board find likewise and accordingly reverse the rejection of these claims and find them allowable.

ARGUMENT

1. Introduction: Claims 1, 2 and 6-25 should be allowed

With this Appeal, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 6-8, 13-19 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the proposed combination of the Leber, Yairi and Kay references. Further, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the rejection of claims 9-12 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the proposed combination of the Leber, Yairi, Kay and Kennewick references.

2. Obviousness

To determine whether a claim is obvious, the scope and contents of the prior art at the time the invention was made must first be determined. *Graham v. John Deere*, 148 USPQ 459 (S.Ct. 1966). Only references from analogous arts may be considered to evaluate obviousness. *In re Oetiker*, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Analogous references are from the same field as the invention, or are reasonably pertinent to the particular problem to be solved, or are those that would have logically commended themselves to the inventor's attention in considering the problem to be solved. *In re Oetiker*; *In re Clay*, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Once the prior art is properly defined, the differences between the claimed invention as a whole and the prior art as a whole are evaluated. *Graham v. John Deere*; *Hodosh v. Block Drug Co., Inc.*, 229 USPQ 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986)(Rich, C.J.). This first requires construing the claims, according to the broadest reasonable meaning that the claim language would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(en banc)(Mayer, J. and Newman, J., dissenting). The test is not whether the individual differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious or not. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

The Supreme Court has recently provided abundant guidance with respect to rejections based upon a combination of references under 35 U.S.C. §103. While the case is considered to be largely a rejection of the rigid application of the teaching-suggestion-motivation requirement for obviousness, it does reiterate that the analytical framework for the rejection should be made explicit. Moreover, “Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” (*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ 2d 1385, 1396 (2007) (citing *In re Kahn*, 78 USPQ 2d 1329 (CAFC 2006)).

3. Claims 1, 2 and 6-8, 13-19 and 21-25 are patentable, as they are not obvious in view of the cited prior art

On page 3 of the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2007, the Examiner rejected independent claim 1 as being rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by the combination of Leber (US Pub. 2003/0182391) in view of Yairi (US Pub. 2004/0078424), and further in view of Kay (US Pub. 2003/0074410). With a “Second Amendment After Final” mailed on March 5, 2008, Appellant essentially moved the elements of former dependent claims 4 and 5 into independent claim 1. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on April 23, 2008, in which it was indicated that the amendment moving the elements of claims 4 and 5 into claim 1 would be entered. In the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2007, the Examiner also finally rejected dependent claims 4 and 5 as being rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Consistent with this history of prosecution, Appellant would like to focus the evaluation of the currently appealed independent claim 1 on the final rejection of claims 4 and 5 (see page 8 of the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2007). These claims were rejected in view based on a proposed combination of the Leber, Yairi and Kay references. For reasons that will be explained in detail below, it is respectfully submitted that these features of the currently appealed independent claim 1 are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references considered independently or in combination.

Before turning to elements of claim 1 in detail, it is first pointed out that this independent

claim is not focused solely on a dialogue-based user interface, and is not focused solely on a subscription/authorization system, but instead is focused on a combination of a dialogue-based user interface and a subscription/authorization system. Still further, the claim is limited to a scenario wherein a user directs dialog at a “simulated entity,” and in doing so, issues a command for a “task” to be performed. Even further, the claim is limited to a scenario in which the user is presented with an opportunity to purchase access when it is determined that the user is not authorized to utilize an application necessary to complete performance of the task.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner seems to equate the claimed “task” with registering with a portal before being allowed to access an instant messaging system. It is respectfully submitted that this logic is flawed. The request for performance of the claimed task logically must occur after access has already been obtained, for example, because, as claimed, performance is requested in the form of dialog directed to a simulated entity within the claimed communication service.

Moving on, on page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner alternatively argues that the former claim 4 limitation, now claim 1 limitation, of “presenting the user with an opportunity to become authorized when the user is not authorized to utilize the application necessary to complete the task” is disclosed in paragraph 40 and in paragraph 49 of Yairi. Notably, this limitation means more than presenting the user with an opportunity to become authorized to use any application, it means presenting an opportunity to become authorized to use an application necessary to execute a task that corresponds to a command communicated through dialog directed at a simulated entity. The Yairi reference does not teach or suggest these limitations.

Yairi paragraph 40, along with paragraph 41, discloses offering composite services (i.e. more than one service working together) to a user. The example disclosed in Yairi paragraph 41 shows a user choosing for a stock quote retrieval service and an auto notification service to work together. This is not equivalent to the claimed process of presenting the user with an opportunity to become authorized when the user is not authorized to utilize the application necessary to complete the requested task. Yairi paragraph 49 discloses offering a user help from a human operator when the user is not satisfied with the results from an automated search. Again, Appellant fails to see

how this is equivalent to the claimed process of presenting an opportunity to become authorized.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the former claim 5 limitation, now claim 1 limitation, of “presenting the user with an opportunity to become authorized comprises presenting the user with an opportunity to purchase access” is disclosed in paragraph 40 and in paragraph 49 of Yairi. A close examination of the cited reference reveals that there is no teaching or suggestion of the noted limitation. Again, Yairi at paragraphs 40 and 41 only discloses offering composite services such as offering a stock quote service and an auto notification service together. Paragraph 49 discloses offering a user help from a human operator when the user is not satisfied with the results from an automated search. None of these paragraphs disclose anything similar to the claimed process of “presenting presenting the user with an opportunity to purchase access.” Yairi does not disclose anything about a user being authorized, about presenting a user an opportunity to become authorized, and Yairi certainly does not disclose anything about an opportunity to purchase access that corresponds to a task/command as claimed.

For at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully contends that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references considered independently or in combination. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the rejection of claim 1.

Further, Appellant respectfully contends that claims 2, 6-8, 13-19 and 21-25 are patentable at least based on their dependence upon the patentable independent claim 1. Moreover, at least some of these dependent claims recite additional limitations that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references. Claim 2 further limit the step of analyzing the dialog to analyzing to determine which of a variety of applications is necessary to complete the task. Claims 6 and 7 further limit how dialog with the claimed simulated entity is conducted. Claims 8-12 further limits how the claimed task is performed. These are just examples of dependent claims. Consideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 6-8, 13-19 and 21-25 are respectfully solicited.

5. Claims 9-12 and 20 are patentable, as the proposed combination is inadequately supported and falls short of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness

Appellant respectfully contends that claims 9-12 and 20 are patentable at least based on

their dependence upon the patentable independent claim 1. Moreover, at least some of these dependent claims are believed to be in allowable form based on the merit of their own limitations. Claims 9-12 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on a proposed combination of Leber (US Pub. 2003/0182391) in view of Yairi (US Pub. 2004/0078424), in view of Kay (US Pub. 2003/0074410), and still further in view of Kennewick (US Pub. 2004/0193420).

Appellant respectfully points out that the fact that a claimed invention is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art is not sufficient by itself to establish prima facie obviousness. See M.P.E.P. at §2143.01. Even in instances where references relied upon in combination do teach all aspects of a claimed invention, that still is not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).

It is fundamental that rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 must be based on evidence comprehended by the language of that section. In *re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 739, 218 USPQ 769, 775 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The factual inquiry whether to combine references must be thorough and searching. *Id.* It must be based on objective evidence of record. In *re Sang Su Lee*, Case No. 00-1158, *7(Fed. Cir., January 18, 2022)(Fed. Cir. BBS). Particular finding must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed. In *re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

In the latest Office Action, in order to reject Appellant's claims 9-12 and 20, the Examiner cites four different references that, in the Examiner's estimation, would be obvious to combine. Other than to say that they are "analogous art," the Examiner provides little or no explanation as to why it would be obvious to combine the Leber and Yairi references. The Examiner argues it would be obvious to add Yairi to the mix simply because doing so would "overcome shortcomings of SMS." As to why it would be obvious to add in Kennewick, the fourth reference, the Examiner simply states that the motivation "would have been to allow or natural language speech queries or commands in a vehicular environment." The Examiner provides no explanation, whatsoever, as to why it would be obvious to combine the teachings of all four references in order to arrive at the

limitations of Applicant's claims 9-12 and 20.

The support for the proposed combination amounts to nothing more than 1) a bald statement that the four references are from "analogous art"; and 2) an identification of a potential benefit associated with just two of the references in the proposed combination. As to this second item, no indication is given as to why one skilled in the art would have been so motivated to combine the references in order to achieve the stated benefits. Other than a pointer to the two benefits discussed in the prior art, no specific citations are made to any of the four references that would demonstrate a teaching or suggestion for combining the references. No explanation is given as to what knowledge possessed or specific principle known by a skilled artisan would lead to combination. No recognition is given to applicable trends in the art. No explanation is provided as to how knowing the problem or recognizing a potential benefit would lead to the claimed invention. No explanation is given as to why the benefits noted by the Examiner are anything more than hindsight observations chosen to justify making a particular combination in order to approximate the invention of Appellant's claims 9-12 and 20.

When the prior art references require selective combination to render obvious a subsequent invention, there must be some reason for the combination other than the hindsight gleaned from the invention itself. *Uniroyal Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.*, 5 USPQ2d 1434 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In the present application, no such reason has been provided to explain the selection and combination of certain teachings from each applied reference. The only conclusion that can be reached from the alleged combinability of the references is the impermissible hindsight gleaned from the present invention. See, e.g., *Ex parte Haymond*, 41 USPQ2d 1217, 1220 (BdPatApp&Int 1996)(the examiner "may not, because he doubts that the invention is patentable, resort to speculation, unfounded assumptions or hindsight reconstruction to supply deficiencies in the factual basis.).

Finally, Appellant recognizes the Examiner has the right to combine any number of references in order to reject claims, so long as the references in combination teach the recited elements and a suggestion exists for combining them. As was stated above, Appellant submits that the Examiner has provided no support for a suggestion to combine the four references. In addition,

Applicant respectfully submits that, because the Examiner is required to combine so many diverse references in order to even reject the claims, this in and of itself, argues that the claims are non-obvious because the combination of references is non-obvious. At some point, it becomes clear that no one skilled in the art could ever even conceive such a complex and diverse combination, much less consider it obvious. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited rejection has moved beyond that point.

Simply stated, the Office Action does not provide any objective evidence that shows a motivation to combine the four references. Without such objective evidence, no prima facie case of obviousness has been made. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 9-12 and 20 is improper. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully solicited.

6. Conclusion

With this response, Appellant submits an earnest effort to address all issues raised in the Final Office Action of November 1, 2007 and the Advisory Action of April 23, 2008.

Appellant respectfully submits that, as described above, the cited prior art does not teach or make obvious the combination of features recited in the claims, either alone or in combination. Appellant asserts that it is the combination of elements recited in the claim, when the claims are interpreted as a whole, which is patentable. Appellant has emphasized certain features in the claims as clearly not present in the cited references, as discussed above. However, Appellant does not concede that other features in the claims are found in the prior art. Rather, for the sake of simplicity, Appellant is providing examples of why the claims described above are distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Appellant wishes to clarify for the record, if necessary, that the claims have been amended to expedite prosecution. Moreover, Appellant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter recited in the original or prior claims in a continuation application.

To the extent any amendments made to the claims might be considered to be narrowing amendments, such revisions in the present Amendment are not to be construed as a surrender of any subject matter between the original claims and the present claims. Again, to the extent

revisions to the claims have been made, they are merely Appellant's best attempt at providing a definition of what Appellant believes to be suitable patent protection. In addition, the present claim provides the intended scope of protection that Appellant is seeking for this application. Therefore, no estoppel should be presumed, and Appellant's claims are intended to include a scope of protection under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Further, Appellant hereby retracts any arguments and/or statements made during prosecution that were rejected by the Examiner during prosecution and/or that were unnecessary to obtain allowance, and only maintain the arguments that persuaded the Examiner with respect to the allowability of the present claims, as one of ordinary skill would understand from a review of the prosecution history. That is, Appellant specifically retracts statements that one of ordinary skill would recognize from reading the file history were not necessary, not used and/or were rejected by the Examiner in allowing the patent application.

For all the reasons advanced above, Appellant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2 and 6-25 of this application is in condition for allowance, and that such action is earnestly solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Christopher L. Holt/
Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
Suite 1400, 900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone:(612) 334-3222 Fax:(612) 334-3312

CLH:rkp

Claims Appendix

Claims on appeal, as they currently stand:

1. A computer implemented method for task execution based on dialog-based communication with a communication service, comprising:
receiving dialog from a user, the dialog being directed to a simulated entity;
analyzing the dialog to identify a command;
performing a task on the user's behalf based on the command;
determining whether the user is authorized to utilize the application necessary to complete the task, and performing the task only if the user is authorized;
presenting the user with an opportunity to become authorized when the user is not authorized to utilize the application necessary to complete the task; and
wherein presenting the user with an opportunity to become authorized comprises presenting the user with an opportunity to purchase access.
2. The method of claim 1, wherein analyzing the dialog to identify a command comprises analyzing the dialog to determine which of a variety of applications is necessary to complete the task.
3. (Cancelled)
4. (Cancelled)
5. (Cancelled)
6. The method of claim 1, further comprising utilizing the simulated entity to participate in dialog interaction with the user to guide the user in the production of said dialog.

7. The method of claim 6, wherein utilizing the simulated entity to participate in dialog interaction with the user comprises:
 - presenting the user with a plurality of choices; and
 - receiving from the user a selection of one of the plurality of choices.
8. The method of claim 7, wherein performing a task on the user's behalf comprises performing a task tailored to the selection of one of the plurality of choices.
9. The method of claim 1, wherein performing a task on the user's behalf comprises performing a task tailored to a parameter listed in a profile associated with the user.
10. The method of claim 1, wherein performing a task on the user's behalf comprises performing a task tailored to a preference associated with the user.
11. The method of claim 10, wherein the preference is set by the user.
12. The method of claim 10, wherein the preference is automatically set based on a history of user interactions with the simulated entity.
13. The method of claim 1, further comprising determining a geographic location of a device with which the user is communicating with the communication service.
14. The method of claim 13, wherein performing a task on the user's behalf comprises performing a task tailored to the geographic location.

15. The method of claim 1, wherein the communication service is an instant message communication service, and wherein receiving dialog from the user comprises receiving instant message dialog.
16. The method of claim 15, wherein the dialog is directed to a specialized buddy appearing on an instant messaging buddy list associated with the user.
17. The method of claim 1, wherein the communication service is a text messaging communication service, and wherein receiving dialog from the user comprises receiving text messaging dialog.
18. The method of claim 1, wherein the communication service is an email transport service, and wherein receiving dialog from a user comprises receiving an email addressed to the specialized recipient.
19. The method of claim 18, wherein analyzing the dialog to identify a command comprises parsing a textual content of the email.
20. The method of claim 1, wherein the communication service is an automated telephone system, and wherein receiving dialog from a user comprises receiving speech communication.
21. The method of claim 1, wherein analyzing the dialog to identify a command comprises analyzing the dialog to identify a keyword.
22. The method of claim 1, wherein performing a task on the user's behalf comprises interfacing with a software application on behalf of the user to perform a task.

23. The method of claim 1, wherein performing a task on the user's behalf comprises sending an action command to instruct a software application to take action on the user's behalf.
24. The method of claim 1, wherein performing a task on the user's behalf comprises interfacing with a calendar software application.
25. The method of claim 1, wherein execution of the command is contingent upon a set of predetermined circumstances, and wherein performing a task on the user's behalf comprises performing a task when the predetermined set of circumstances have occurred.
26. (Cancelled)
27. (Cancelled)
28. (Cancelled)
29. (Cancelled)
30. (Cancelled)
31. (Cancelled)
32. (Cancelled)
33. (Cancelled)
34. (Cancelled)

35. (Cancelled)

36. (Cancelled)

37. (Cancelled)

38. (Cancelled)

39. (Cancelled)

40. (Cancelled)

41. (Cancelled)

42. (Cancelled)

43. (Cancelled)

44. (Cancelled)

45. (Cancelled)

46. (Cancelled)

47. (Cancelled)

48. (Cancelled).

49. (Cancelled)

50. (Cancelled)

51. (Cancelled)

52. (Cancelled)

53. (Cancelled)

54. (Cancelled)

55. (Cancelled)

56. (Cancelled)

57. (Cancelled)

58. (Cancelled)

59. (Cancelled)

60. (Cancelled)

Evidence Appendix

None.

Related Proceedings Appendix

None.